



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,957	09/29/2003	Craig Nevill-Manning	24207-10063	3799

62296 7590 12/24/2008  
GOOGLE / FENWICK  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA ST.  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
----------

AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/24/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/673,957	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NEVILL-MANNING ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2179	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE. (3) Jon Burbage.

(2) Brian Hoffman. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 18 December 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hess, Sciammarella.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant provided further clarification on the interpretation of the claim language and pointed out how the proposed amendment might overcome the prior art relied upon. The Examiner notes that the discussion of the prior art rejection along with the proposed amendments will require further consideration and an updated search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Weilun Lo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179
--	---